Emily Cooper OSB #182254
ecooper@droregon.org
Thomas Stenson OSB #152894
tstenson@droregon.org
Disability Rights Oregon
511 SW 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 200
Portland, Oregon 97205
(503) 243-2081
Counsel for Plaintiff, Disability Rights Oregon

Jesse Merrithew OSB #074564
jesse@lmhlegal.com
Levi Merrithew Horst PC
610 SW Alder Street, Suite 415
Portland, Oregon 97205
(971) 229-1241
Counsel for Plaintiff, Metropolitan Public Defender

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## DISTRICT OF OREGON

DISABILITY RIGHTS OREGON, METROPOLITAN PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICES INC., and A.J. MADISON,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

JAMES SCHROEDER, in his official capacity as head of the Oregon Health Authority, and DOLORES MATTEUCCI, in her official capacity as Superintendent of the Oregon State Hospital,

Defendants,

and

LEGACY EMANUEL HOSPITAL & HEALTH CENTER d/b/a UNITY CENTER FOR BEHAVIORAL HEALTH; LEGACY

Case No. 3:02-cv-00339-MO (Lead Case) Case No. 3:21-cv-01637-MO (Member Case) Case No. 6:22-cv-01460-MO (Member Case)

PLAINTIFFS' PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SEPTEMBER ORDER REGARDING TRANSPORTATION FROM THE STATE HOSPITAL HEALTH SYSTEM; PEACEHEALTH; and PROVIDENCE HEALTH & SERVICES,

Intervenors.

JAROD BOWMAN, JOSHAWN DOUGLAS-SIMPSON,

Plaintiffs,

DOLORES MATTEUCCI, Superintendent of the Oregon State Hospital, in her individual and official capacity, JAMES SCHROEDER, Direction of the Oregon Health Authority, in his official capacity, and PATRICK ALLEN in his individual capacity,

Defendants,

and

LEGACY EMANUEL HOSPITAL & HEALTH CENTER d/b/a UNITY CENTER FOR BEHAVIORAL HEALTH; LEGACY HEALTH SYSTEM; PEACEHEALTH; and PROVIDENCE HEALTH & SERVICES OREGON,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

JAMES SCHROEDER, in his official capacity as Director of Oregon Health Authority,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:21-cv-01637-MO (Member Case)

Case No. 6:22-cv-01460-MO (Member Case)

#### LR 7-1 CERTIFICATION

The parties and amici conferred extensively regarding this proposed language as ordered by the Court and required by LR 7-1. The Defendants do not oppose this language. Amici counties do oppose this language.

### PROPOSED MODIFICATION

Pursuant to the Court's Order of March 31, 2023 (Dkt. No. 368), Plaintiffs submit the following proposed amendment to paragraph (3)(d) (edits underlined):

Before a patient reaches this maximum duration of commitment for restoration under this Order and remains unfit to proceed, OSH shall notify the committing court of the patient's impending discharge 60 days before the date on which the hospital is required to discharge the patient pursuant to this Order. The Sheriff's Office/Department in the committing jurisdiction shall transport and return the patient to the jail upon notification from OSH that the patient is ready for discharge, except that, where the patient and the committing jurisdiction agree, the Sheriff's Office in the committing jurisdiction will transport the patient to from OSH to another appropriate place. If there is a conflict between this order and the committing jurisdiction, the Supremacy Clause establishes this order takes precedence over any state court order pursuant to Article VI, paragraph 2 of the US Constitution.

And the following amendments to paragraph (3)(f):

No later than March 15, 2023, patients currently admitted at OSH who have exceeded the length of restoration set forth in this Order shall be discharged from their restoration commitment and from the hospital. The Sheriff's Office/Department in the committing jurisdiction shall transport and return the patient to the jail upon notification from OSH that the patient is ready for discharge except that, where the patient and the committing jurisdiction agree, the Sheriff's Office in the committing jurisdiction will transport the patient to from OSH to another appropriate place. If there is a conflict between this order and the committing jurisdiction, the Supremacy Clause establishes this order takes precedence over any state court order pursuant to Article VI, paragraph 2 of the US Constitution.

Plaintiffs rely upon their original motion to support this requested amendment which lays out why the county sheriffs for all practical purposes are the most appropriate

entity to transport patients from the hospital. Their participation is necessary to effectuate the remedial order issued by this Court, which the Court has already found is the least restrictive means of enforcing its injunction.

DATED this 9th day of March, 2023.

### LEVI MERRITHEW HORST PC

/s Jesse Merrithew

Jesse Merrithew OSB # 074564 jesse@lmhlegal.com 610 SW Alder Street, Suite 415 Portland, Oregon 97205 Telephone: (971) 229-1241

Facsimile: (971) 544-7092 Counsel for Plaintiffs Metropolitan Public

Defender, Jarrod Bowman, and Joshawn

Douglas-Simpson

# DISABILITY RIGHTS OREGON

<u>/s Emily Cooper</u>

Emily Cooper OSB # 182254 ecooper@droregon.org Thomas Stenson, OSB # 152894 tstenson@droregon.org 511 SW 10th, Suite 200 Portland OR 97205

Telephone: (503) 243 2081 Facsimile: (503) 243 1738

Counsel for Plaintiff Disability Rights

Oregon